

being the means whereby Hamlet actually detects his father's assassin, he would naturally be wrung to the keenest tension of excitement, was that played most tamely. Mr. Barrett's best scenes were those in the early part of the play, notably that with the Ghost. The really exquisite impersonation of the performance was the Ophelia of Miss Winifred Emery, who with grace of art which induced complete illusion, gave utterance to the mental wanderings of the distraught maiden with such beauty of poetic expression as divested the impersonation of its physical pain whilst

of which fully made up for the length of time taken to prepare it on Monday last. Mr. Gascoigne gave a manly and energetic rendering of the part of Joseph, and found a capable and willing supporter in his talented wife, who essayed the part of Fanny Goodwill. As the kind-hearted parson, Mr. A.

Journalists Time Changes" into a play.—Mr. G. W. Edwards, late of the Savoy Theatre, has been appointed acting-manager of the Alhambra. A new manager, it is said, has also been secured by Mr. G. A. Payne for the Canterbury, viz., Mr. W. Lennon, late chairman of the Marylebone Music Hall.

During the year by his mother, who was the housewife and the men at home.—The magistrate sentenced the prisoner to two months' hard labour. With the consent of the bench, it was intended that the Rev. Benjamin Waight, the secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society, should take the prisoner into his own home, and keep the eldest boy himself. The relieving officer was instructed to see after the welfare of the other children, who will be eventually placed, it was stated, in an industrial school.

Percy Maurice Amos, son of the late Professor Amos, and Henry Eggett, both university students, appeared, on two summonses, at Dorling on the 11th inst., for assault upon a stable West, of the Surrey constabulary, and with obstructing him while in the execution of his duty, while they in turn charged the officer with being drunk. On the night of the 2nd inst. the door of the residence, rented by Mr. Amos, at Box Hill, was opened. He alleged that the defendants entered. Amos caught him by the arm and set a dog on him, and both flourished sticks over his head.—The defence was that in the darkness the policeman was taken for a drunken

[illegible]

W. H. Herbert, Esq., with a note, "Please to forward." He had to go abroad, and wrote to her from Havre. About a week afterwards he came to Brighton, and stayed with her in the same house. He said he was delighted to see her again, and that it had only been a severe illness that had prevented him from communicating with her sooner. He expressed great regret at his condition, and which she had found her house. He said he had sent a man with the rent, and that he had been ill. In November, 1888, he discussed with her the subject of the marriage, and said she had better look out for a house. He gave her to understand that the cause of the delay was financial matters, which he wanted to settle, and as to which she did not inquire. In April, 1890, she discovered that he was a married man, and shortly afterwards in a hotel in Paris, where he had taken her to lunch, she told him so. There was a scene. He confessed it was perfectly true that he was married, and that he had deceived her all along. He said he was very sorry, did not wish to quarrel with her, and desired to make up to her for all the sorrow he had caused her. He said he knew her name was Evelyn.

A VERY CUNNING DECEPTION. but, having begun it, he carried it on. He proposed an arrangement to give her £500 a year, and settle upon her £150 a year for life. No suggestion of that kind came from her. She accepted the proposal; she did not wish to quarrel with him. That was the last interview she had with him. He wrote to her on several occasions afterwards, and in regard to the settlement sent her £200 on account. Mr. Candy quoted from some letters written by Mr. Murray to the plaintiff, in one of which he said, "I came a smasher at Ascot, and am off to Ireland to recruit." Mr. Candy: Do you know anything about the defendant's social position?—I believe he is chief proprietor of the Central News, and I know he writes for the *Fortnightly*.

—The Attorney-general (cross-examining the plaintiff): Have you seen the defendant? The Plaintiff: I have, to the best of my knowledge and ability. Is Mr. Jackson here? I believe so.—Have you seen him? Yes.—Have you subpoenaed him? I have not.—What is Mr. Jackson's Christian name? Beetham.—Anything else? Have you heard of his passing under the name of Beetham, or Beetham Evelyn Jackson? Yes.—When? I think it was in 1888. It was not his real name.—Why did he call himself Evelyn? I believe it had something to do with private affairs of his own connected with his wife.—You lived with him for some time and passed as Mrs. Evelyn? Not before May, 1890.—You swear you were not intimate with him for a long time before? Yes. I was not living with him as Mrs. Evelyn until after I found the defendant was a married man. I lived with him and passed as Mrs. Evelyn in Paris, in London, and elsewhere. We passed as Mr. and Mrs. Evelyn.—Cross-examination continued: She was not living with Evelyn Jackson still. She left him about three months ago, soon after he knew about the action. The name of her sister's boy was Walter Evelyn, but his real name was Walter Lockington, and his father sent her money for him from America every month. The boy's mother, Mrs. Lockington, was dead. She (the plaintiff) did not take the name of Mrs. Evelyn until 1891. She lived for some time with Mr. Evelyn Jackson in the same house at Monte Carlo, and then she went to the Continent. She knew he was married, but at that time he was separated from his wife. She never lived with him as Mrs. Jackson. Another person lived with him as Mrs. Jackson.—Asked by the Attorney-general if she recognised as Wilfred Murray the defendant—a stout, elderly gentleman—she replied that she did. Wilfred Murray said he left with her a number of letters of a very improper and revolting character, with some hundreds of indecent photographs, and disgusting literature, which she generally destroyed, and which she could not produce one or two persons who had seen her with the defendant. She had heard that he denied the truth of her whole story, and she was surprised at it. In December, 1887, she was anxious to continue on the stage, and she received a letter from Mr. Wilson Barrett and from his secretary, Mr. George Augustus Sala, to these letters in her diary. The Attorney-general: Did the man who passed in the name of Wilfred Murray bring this gentleman (pointing to the defendant) to your house at West Kensington? No. It was that gentleman. I have never known any other Wilfred Murray but the defendant.—Did you recite in his presence? Never.—Did Wilfred Murray tell you he had asked a gentleman to write to Mr. Wilson Barrett to help you? He told me he had asked a friend, but he mentioned no names.—Except that which Wilfred Murray told you, had you any other introduction to Mr. Wilson Barrett? None other.—After he made that communication, did you receive a letter from Mr. Wilson Barrett? Yes. Did you buy all your dresses at the same time? No.—Read the entry in your diary with regard to your first meeting the defendant on April 7th.—Witness (reading): "Rode in 'bus to Sloane-street. After shopping got into 'bus going to West Kensington, in which I saw a gentleman. An inexplicable feeling seized me. It was as though an electric shock passed through me, and I felt as if I was experiencing much the same strange sensation as myself, I felt greatly agitated. He never took his eyes off me. When I got out Faust followed me. My heart was beating wildly, and I thought of taking to my heels, but then I thought it would be silly and undignified, and I also had a feeling that I should like to know him."—Cross-examination continued: She went through the ceremony of self-introduction. After all that was very terrible, and he seemed awfully nice. Besides, I feel sure he is a gentleman in every sense of the word." That was written the same night or the next day.—Would you represent that you were an innocent girl? I do not represent it.—You have not represented? Have you had any other introduction before? With one man.—Cross-examination continued: She made an entry in her diary on May 24th, when the intimacy commenced. She said, "Something very bad has happened."

WHAT A WRETCHED, WRETCHED FOOL I HAVE BEEN.

I feel I shall bitterly regret it as women always do." Defendant wrote indecent letters to her shortly after the engagement. She said in her diary he showed her "a pile of pictures and books of a startling, and, I must say, disgusting description. She dared not look, but she forced to read such passages as he wrote, and she knew not what she was doing.—Have you entered the dates of your intimacy with Jackson? There was no need to do so, because I was living with him.—Cross-examination continued: She kept a diary because it amused her.—Did you not intend to use it if occasion arose? I never anticipated that occasion would arise.—Why did you write down such disgusting accounts of your love with him, and it was not disgusting to me at the time.—Cross-examination continued: Wilfred Murray induced her to procure an abortion. She did not think she was committing a crime at that stage. She mentioned the matter in her diary.—Re-examined: During the whole of her acquaintance with the defendant she never called him by the name of Wilfred Murray. It was perfectly false that Mr. Herbert brought to her by a friend named Wilfred Murray. She was

never introduced to Mr. Herbert by any one whatever. During the time she was engaged to be married to the defendant she was not living with Mr. Jackson as his mistress or his wife. She did not at that time live with or have immoral relations with any man whatever. The other side had notice that she had diaries on both sides. There was no foundation for the suggestion that these books had been made for the purposes of this action. There was no other handwriting in the book except her own. She had been intimate with a gentleman previous to meeting the defendant, but that was some considerable time before. She never knew that Mr. Herbert tipped his identity with Mr. Murray till now.—Mr. Beetham Jackson said he was out of business at present. In 1886 he was a musical and dramatic agent at 74, Strand.



He made the acquaintance of plaintiff some years ago, and acted as a business agent for her. He got engagements for her, and she played at various theatres. At that time they were not living together. While at Monte Carlo there were no immoral relations between the plaintiff and himself. He saw defendant call at plaintiff's house where he had lodgings. About twelve months ago he asked plaintiff to live with him. His immoral relations with her ceased nearly three months ago.—Cross-examined: He had not ordered things for the house in the name of Mr. Evelyn. His last wife ceased living with him about three years ago. Since he had given up business he had lived on money he had saved and made. He had lived on £700 he had invested since the end of 1888. He met the plaintiff in Paris, in 1889.

HE ACTED AS HER MANAGER.

He took apartments for her, and did other business for her. He took rooms for her in the name of Mrs. Evelyn. He had known Mr. Newbolt, solicitor, in connection with theatrical matters; but he did not recommend the plaintiff to go to him. He did not see the defendant in and about the plaintiff's house at Kensington, but he said he spoke to him. He never knew him by any other name than that of Murray.—Re-examined by Mr. Candy: He had not the slightest knowledge of this action until it was brought, and had never discussed the matter with the solicitor. It was not true that he lived with the plaintiff as man and wife. He was never introduced by any one to the defendant. He had not the slightest doubt as to the identity of Wilfred Murray with the defendant.—Eliza Bagnell, who had been cook to the plaintiff, also said the defendant was Wilfred Murray.—Was there anything peculiar you noticed about him? Yes. I noticed there was a lump at the back of his head, or rather the back of his neck, and he told her he was pleased with her, and she must come with them (the plaintiff and herself) when they were married.—Cross-examined: Mr. Jackson used to order things for the plaintiff in the name of Mrs. Evelyn. The plaintiff's housemaid had since married and gone to Australia. Mrs. Evelyn was a wedding-dress, and she supposed her to be a widow. She knew she was engaged to be married to Murray.—Mr. Reynolds, clerk to Mr. Newbolt, solicitor, gave evidence to the effect that some difficulty was experienced in serving on the defendant the writ in the action, and that an order had to be obtained for substituted service.—Cross-examined: He was aware that at the time referred to Mr. Herbert was in America, and he was not in London. Mr. George Augustus Sala as a witness to speak to certain handwriting. He knew Mr. Sala was an old friend of Mr. Herbert's. Mr. Sala was in court on the previous day and the day before, and had been shown some letters with the view of seeing whether he could identify the handwriting as the defendant's. Mr. Sala was not in court, and he would not be called.—Mr. Candy: The interview with Mr. Sala was with myself.—Mr. P. Blancham, secretary to the *Fortnightly Review*, said he believed that some letters which were handed to him were in Mr. Herbert's handwriting, but he had only seen him write once.—This was the plaintiff's case.

THE DEFENCE.

The Attorney-general, in opening the case for the defendant, said he hoped to show by the evidence he should call that this action was a wicked attempt to blackmail and extort money from a respectable gentleman, against whom, so far as he was instructed, no single breath of slander or disrepute had ever before been breathed. Since 1882, down to about the middle of 1890, Mr. Herbert had from time to time employed a kind of secretary, a man known to him by the name of Wilfred Murray, but having various aliases. Murray was employed by Mr. Herbert in making inquiries for him in connection with literary and other matters. Long before the matter of this action came up, Murray presented to Mr. Herbert for signature a letter, which struck him as being so like his (defendant's) handwriting that it seemed as if he had written it himself. In 1887 Murray told him there was a person he was anxious to get upon the stage, whom he had been acquainted with in Paris, and asked if he could assist him. Mr. Herbert knew very few people connected with the stage, but he happened to know Mr. Wilson Barrett, and asked him to help him. He was taken to house in West Kensington, which he could not now identify, and heard her recite some extracts from a play. Thereupon he mentioned her to Mr. Wilson Barrett, and that was the beginning and end of his personal acquaintance with her. Mr. Herbert would swear that it was absolutely untrue that he ever saw or knew any of the numerous places she had referred to in her evidence. In September, 1889, a letter

HEARTLESS AND CRUEL CONDUCT

on the part of Mr. Herbert, and asking for money, was addressed to Mrs. Herbert. Other letters of a similar nature were received from time to time by Mr. Herbert asking for assistance for a woman calling herself Evelyn Herbert. When the jury heard the facts they would be able to form their own conclusions as to the way in which these communications came to be made, and as to the origin of the letters which had been produced by the plaintiff as coming from the defendant. The man who could write some of the abominable things in those letters must be the most debased and brutal creature that ever lived. The jury would be able to judge for themselves whether such letters were likely to have been written by a gentleman of the character of Mr. Herbert, and as to the alleged intimacy

with the plaintiff, it would be proved beyond question that on some of the instances spoken to by the plaintiff as occurring in this country Mr. Herbert was actually abroad. It would be shown that in four instances in 1887 the diary produced by the plaintiff as having been written by her at the time of the occurrence to which they related was not a truthful record of what happened, but was simply something made up from some other diary for the purpose of this action. It would be proved that Mr. Herbert was not at Brighton at all on occasions when he was alleged to have met the plaintiff there. What he (the learned counsel) suggested was that at the times to which the diary related the plaintiff was carrying on, not with Mr. Herbert, but with the man already mentioned, who went under the name of Wilfred Murray or with some other paramour. The defendant said she came into court, not for the mere purpose of saving a few pounds, but with the object of resenting

A GROSS ATTEMPT TO LEVY BLACKMAIL.

He should call the defendant and other witnesses, and, strange as the story they would tell might appear, and impossible as it might be to understand how such a conspiracy could be entered into, yet he should ask them to believe the story, and give a verdict for the defendant.—Mr. Herbert's counsel said the defendant, said he resided at 10, De Vere Gardens. He was an American citizen. He had resided in England since the beginning of 1886. He was married in 1884. His wife, except when on visits, had been living with him ever since. His wife had been in Rome since the beginning of the trial, and after hearing the plaintiff's evidence he had telegraphed to her. He first saw plaintiff in the course of the year 1887. He could not tell the month, and even as to whether it was summer, or spring, or winter he had the haziest recollection. To his knowledge he only saw the plaintiff twice. He went to see her at the request of a person who had been in his employment, and who was afterwards in his employment. His name was Wilfred Murray. He had an impression, drawn from his knowledge of Murray, that he passed under a great many names. He had a habit when he was bringing information which he thought was of a dangerous character to himself of asking visitors to allow him to pass under some other name than his own. He had a habit of recollecting who he was. He went under the name of M'Dermott, Wyndham, Russell, and Rolland. He always knew him as Wilfred Murray.—On the first occasion that he referred to the plaintiff, what did he say?—Mr. Candy objected to evidence being given of whom he intended to call or to account for his absence.—The Attorney-general submitted it was evidence, having regard to the important issues raised.—His lordship sustained the objection.—Witness said he last saw Wilfred Murray in the early summer or late spring of 1890 in London. In consequence of some business Murray said he went to see the plaintiff somewhere in West Kensington. He saw a person whom he believed to be Mrs. Evelyn, but he was very near sighted, and could not see. Murray went with him. The substance of the conversation was that plaintiff wished to go on the stage, and that she had had distresses connected with her marriage. He said he had a husband whom she had left in Paris. He talked about her interest in the drama, and gave him the impression that she had appeared on the stage, and wanted to be placed in communication with a manager. Peter Murray acted as a sort of secretary in 1882 and 1883 he found Murray had a great deal of information about the American Irish, and he brought witness a good deal of information about their convention in 1883. When he retired from his profession in America he ceased to employ Murray, but he afterwards employed him in London, when Murray came and found him out. He noticed a similarity between Murray's writing and his, and Murray was rather proud of his capacity to imitate handwriting. He signed letters written by Murray, and the writing was similar. He denied that various documents were in his handwriting. In Southwell Gardens he only saw Murray in his study.

SHE RECITED TWO OR THREE PRICKS.

He did not know what they were, but they were recited very well. He mentioned Wilson Barrett's name. He said the only persons he knew who could take any steps of the kind were Henry Irving or Wilson Barrett, and he judged from what she had said, that the latter was more likely than the other to find her employment. He and Wilfred Murray left together. Later on Murray asked him to go to the plaintiff's again. That was two or three weeks afterwards. He met Murray at the house of a friend, and he was introduced to a melodramatic character and plaintiff recited parts. He wrote to Mr. Wilson Barrett probably between the two interviews. From the time when he saw her on the second occasion he had never, to his knowledge, seen her since till these proceedings. He first employed Murray in the year 1881 in New York. He could not say whether he was an American. He believed he was born in Jamaica. He employed him for translation and transcription. Witness was then conducting an important matter in regard to China, Peru, and the United States, his brother having been United States Minister in Peru. Murray would be about 30 years of age now. Witness was 63. Murray was somewhere about his own age. He could not say how long he had known him, but he knew him by his name in his own name but his own. He never passed in the name of Wilfred Murray, or Gaston, or Wyndham Russell, or any other alias. In 1889 he wrote a book called "Ireland under Coercion," and in 1888, when he employed Murray, he wrote a book entitled, "France and the Republic." He saw Murray in France, and he was intimate with him. He was in the Boulogne. From 1881 to 1889 Murray was working for him and on. He had not seen him since 1889. In regard to the incident of the postal order, the witness said that Murray asked him, while they were at the post office, to pay for a postal order for him, which he did. Afterwards he heard the money had miscarried, when it was found that the latter had been put in an envelope without an address. He did not send it to the plaintiff in Paris. The defendant was taken through a large amount of correspondence, which he denied having written or having any knowledge of.

MR. WILSON BARRETT'S EVIDENCE.

Mr. Wilson Barrett, called by the Attorney-general, said he had been a great many years connected with the theatrical profession. He had known defendant for many years. He did not remember having seen plaintiff. He received an application from Mr. Herbert on behalf of a lady in whom he was somewhat interested. Mr. Herbert never wrote to him by any other name than that of Herbert. He could not remember her name, but he called her the lady in the box, and the defendant was quite possible she did come and see him between acts at the theatre.—The defendant then re-entered the box, and was further questioned as to letters he received signed "Emmeline Herbert," at Chesham-row, Chelsea. He produced all the letters which he had received of that character, which he wrote that if he had kept holy the promises he had made she would never have called at his house.

SHE WAS DRIVEN DESPERATE.

—She also asked him for £23 for arrears. This was the first application for money. He received another letter from her, dated

Hotel-on-the-Sole, in which she pleaded for her child's sake, and said she courted death herself. He had tried hard to discover Murray. He had tried in New York, Philadelphia, and Paris, but had failed to find him. He did not know where he was in London. He produced the seals which he had worn for the last five years. He never sealed a letter with a large "H," similar to that on the envelope which the plaintiff produced. Another envelope bore the ordinary seal of the Orleans Club. Murray used to see him in the Orleans Club. He would have no difficulty in getting paper and envelopes at the club if he asked for them. He never met the plaintiff in an omnibus, followed her home, and introduced himself as Mr. Wilfred Murray. He never visited or had intercourse with her, and never promised her marriage. He never wrote to her on Treasury Chambers paper. He did once go to see Mr. Goschen at the Treasury Chambers. The letter in question was in the handwriting of Mr. Wilfred Murray. He denied that he had taken the plaintiff to the Grosvenor Hotel. He was perfectly well known at the hotel, and stayed there for several days more than once at the beginning of 1888. He had, while abroad, made records of guide books and other books which he might be reading. The time it was alleged he first met the plaintiff he was spending in company with his wife at Knolly House, Wiltshire, belonging to Mr. Alfred Seymour, between Semley and Salisbury. The exact day on which the plaintiff said she saw him was the Thursday before Good Friday. He was in Florence the following day with his wife.

HE WAS IN BRUSSELS

on the 6th of May. It was not true that on that day he went down to see the plaintiff and presented her with an engagement ring. He and his wife spent four or five days in Florence. On the last of June, 1888, he was in Brighton, and stayed at the Orleans Resident Club. On Jubilee Day, June 21st, he saw the celebration from 148, Piccadilly, Lord Rothschild's house. He never told the plaintiff he saw it from Aspley House. Mrs. Herbert was at Southwell Gardens, living with him in September, 1887, and she went to her niece, Mrs. Ernest Beckett's house at Kirkstall Grange, where they spent a fortnight for part of the time. He denied that he was at Ghent with the plaintiff on the 1st of September. He was not at the Hotel in Suisse, at Brussels, on the 2nd of September, with the plaintiff. He was at Chartres on the 29th of September. He and his wife left London in the December following for Rome, where they spent the winter of 1888. He was not in London on the 17th of December, as she had represented. When he was writing his Irish book he went backwards and forwards between Ireland and England. Murray met him repeatedly during that time. He did not go to Brighton in October, 1888. He spent Christmas in 1888 in Paris. He left London on the 17th of December, and travelled with two lady friends. He did not desire to give the names, but he would write them down with the consent of the court. He stayed at the Hotel de l'Empire. His wife had gone on before him, and went on to Rome for Christmas. He remained at Paris and went to Rome. He was at Versailles on January 29th, 1889, and he was in Rome, between April 10th and 23rd, 1889. He went to Milan in the spring of 1889. He denied that May, 1889.

HE HAD PROMISED TO MARRY THE PLAINTIFF

eight times, or that he was at four hotels or restaurants in Paris with her. The memorandum in the guide book, headed "France," referred to a visit he paid to the province of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg. He placed the substituted service order in the hands of Mr. Oakley Hall, an American barrister, of Dances Inn, as a friend. He had not attempted to ascertain where Mr. Hall was at this moment. He knew Mr. Oakley Hall went to plaintiff's solicitor. He told him to do what he thought necessary. Mr. Hall told him that if he did not see any occasion he would consult a solicitor. Mr. Hall told him he saw the correspondence. Mr. Oakley Hall had been in his employment for some years in New York, and would know his handwriting more or less. Ten years ago the witness was editing the *New York World*, and Mr. Hall assisted him. He ought to have known his handwriting, and he probably did. He did not tell him he was satisfied the letters were in his (witness's) handwriting.—Mr. Candy: What are you laughing at? I see nothing to laugh at.—Mr. Hall went to see if the matter was a trumped up case, and told him the letters were of a disgraceful and disgusting character. He took Mr. Hall to Messrs. Lewis, Smith, and Braithwaite, Messrs. Travers, Smith, and Braithwaite, and refused to take up his case. They were never asked to act for him. On consultation with his wife he made up his mind, seeing that this entertainment was going on, that the most fit, intelligent, and proper person to deal with it in Great Britain was Mr. George Lewis. (Laughter.) Defendant added: "Without any consultation with any body but my wife, I went to George Lewis's house on a Sunday morning, but he was out of town. Mr. Wilfred Murray was dark and grizzled. It was a matter of opinion as to whether he was distinguished in appearance. He would not admit that he might be mistaken for himself. Mr. Justice Cave said when two men were compared

THEY GENERALLY FELT INSULTED.

(Laughter.) Mr. Candy said that was not always so; he himself had been compared to Mr. Samuel Pope, and he did not feel insulted. (Laughter.) The defendant continued: Murray said that he knew all about the Boulogne party, and prided himself on being able to imitate other people's handwriting. He repeated that the omnibus episode was untrue. He was now eight years old, and he was sitting in front of the learned counsel from the person sitting next to her. There was no truth whatever in the plaintiff's story. The statement in the plaintiff's diary that she loved him, and that his kisses told her how much he loved her, was a lie. He was also asked to produce a false that he gave her a diamond engagement ring. He could not say whether the description "distinguished appearance" of the person who met the plaintiff in the omnibus would describe Mr. Wilfred Murray. He traced Murray to Philadelphia, but he would not say how long ago. He wished Mr. Murray was here.—The Attorney-general said for obvious reasons it ought not to be stated publicly where he was to be found.—Mr. Candy did not assent to that.—The defendant said he heard of him about three weeks ago. He would write down the place where he believed him to be. The defendant then wrote down the place, and

the paper was handed round to the counsel. He had been in communication with the American police, and had tried hard to produce Murray. The records in the guide books were made contemporaneously. Mr. Beckett's evidence had been taken as to the time the defendant was at Brighton in June, 1887. He was at Doncaster in September, 1887, when it was asserted by the plaintiff that

HE WAS WITH HER AT GHENT.

He did not visit Bruges with the plaintiff before going to Ghent, and her statement in her diary that they "trotted over the old place and visited churches" was not true, nor was it true that he was admitted into the nuns' domains, and that his gallant manners won their hearts. He did not purchase some lace for the plaintiff from the nuns. He had not a severe illness in Paris in 1888, as described by the plaintiff in her diary, nor did he receive a blow afterwards from the eyes. Defendant did not go to Rome with his wife at the end of that year for important reasons. He was not at Richmond in 1887. He was conversant with French, but had no knowledge of the plaintiff's French. Mr. Murray spoke French well.—Mr. Candy asked witness if he was a connoisseur of wines. Defendant said he knew port from champagne. (Laughter.) Mr. Candy: But that would not make you an expert. (Laughter.) Defendant stated that he had drunk Italian wines, but not from choice. He had never visited the field of Waterloo.

HE HAD BEEN AT MONTE CARLO

and had foolishly lost a few Napoleons.—Mr. Candy: Have you any system which you could recommend to those who do not want to lose who go out to Monte Carlo?—The Defendant: I regret I have not.—Mr. Candy: I would be obliged if you have.—The Defendant: I would give it with pleasure, but I would advise you not to do it. The statement made by the witness who was a cook in plaintiff's service that he hoped to retain her services when he married Mrs. Evelyn was not true. The statements of Mr. Jackson were equally untrue. He never sent letters to Paris to be posted there. The defendant further requested to show his watch, which was handed to the plaintiff. He was then asked if it chimed, and he said it did, but it was now out of order. He did not think Mr. Wilfred Murray suffered from short sight. He, personally, had been short-sighted all his life.—In re-examination by the Attorney-general, the defendant was further questioned as to two of the letters which were asserted were written by Wilfred Murray. He denied that he ever gave any improper books or publications to any woman letters of a disgusting and atrocious character. He never evaded service of the writ. He was a clever man, a clever man, George Herbert, hall porter at the Grosvenor Hotel, Victoria Station, was next called, and said he knew the defendant as Mr. Herbert, and by no other name. In 1887 someone was staying at the hotel under the name of Wilfred Murray.

LORD ROTHSCHILD'S EVIDENCE.

Lord Rothschild was the first witness called. He said that on Jubilee Day in 1887 he had a large party at his house, 148, Piccadilly, for the purpose of witnessing the procession. Mr. Herbert, who was one of his guests, came about ten o'clock and remained until two or three o'clock.—There was some cross-examination of the witness.

A HOUSEMAID'S STATEMENT.

Phoebe Burton, who had been in the defendant's service for two years and eight months as housemaid, said she answered the door in the absence of the defendant's servants. Mr. Herbert was a great deal indoors, and worked in the billiard-room. A man used to visit him, who gave the name of Rowling or Rolland. He was tall, stoutly built, and dark. She let him into the house often, mostly in the evening. He usually showed him into the billiard-room, and she went to bed. He remained there until about 11 o'clock, and then he remained in Southwell Gardens up to the April of 1889. After that time she never answered the door. It was answered by the man-servant, who left Mr. Herbert's service last year. On one occasion the gentleman dined with Mr. Herbert, and they talked about Ireland.

In cross-examination by Mr. Candy, the witness said the gentleman was darker than Mr. Herbert. They were sometimes alike in their appearance, but she could not say what it was. He was of the same height as Mr. Herbert, bald, and had an iron grey moustache. She could not carry her memory a little further down and say if he had a grey beard. He had dark hair. She had never heard him called by any other name than that of Rolland or Rowling.

engraving to any one?—Defendant: Not that I remember. It depends upon the definition of the word "engraving." There were those who said it was an engraving and the "Dacorum" were not. —Mr. Candy: Do you think they are indecent?—The Defendant: I decline to answer. That question must be considered out of this court.—Mr. Candy: Did you ever live at 12, St. James's-place, South Kensington?—The Defendant: I did.—Mr. Candy: Was your landlady, Mrs. Deane?—Mr. Deane was here called, and the defendant admitted that he had been his landlady at that place in 1883.—Mr. Candy: Had you a large number of filthy and revolting prints and pictures in your wardrobe at that place?—The Defendant: I will explain.—Mr. Candy: Answer, yes or no.—Mr. Justice Cave said the witness was entitled to explain.—The Defendant: A friend of mine, no longer living, had a package of French and Italian things, pictures and drawings, sent to him. He had access to my room and the things in my room. I was an unmarried man at the time, and my room was entirely at his service, and there they were found.—Mr. Candy: And the gentleman thought there was no more suitable place to leave them?—The Defendant: I am not called upon to accept your opinion of a dead friend of mine.—Mr. Candy: You never had the curiosity to examine them?—The Defendant: I had not.—Mr. Candy: It was I suppose a trumpery matter.—The Defendant then left the court, and was instructed to bring to the court a number of signatures.—The plaintiff was recalled by Mr. Candy, and was asked a few questions as to her brother-in-law, Mr. Lockington, who had sent her her remittances to maintain the child.

FOR THE DEFENDANT.

—The Attorney-general then proceeded to sum up for the defendant, urging that the action of the plaintiff was an abominable conspiracy, which the evidence of Mr. Herbert had exposed. The jury could not believe that the defendant would have gone into the witness-box and made the statements he had made, if he were a true man. He pointed out what he considered the inconsistency of the plaintiff's story, especially with regard to her assertion that the defendant, who was married man, took her to hotels where he was well known. He suggested that the whole of the letters were written by Wilfred Murray, but he questioned as to whether Murray had promised a marriage to the plaintiff. Mr. Herbert had promised a marriage to a charitable man in assisting the plaintiff to get an introduction to Mr. Wilson Barrett. The plaintiff had suppressed the fact of her intimacy with Jackson in order to justify her claim on the defendant. Her representations were fraudulent, and had for their intention the extorting of money. She was an abandoned and dissolute woman, and she could trace her life. He reminded the jury that though the defendant was said to have had a packet of improper pictures and books at his residence, left by a dead friend, the accusation was made by a woman who had kept for years a series of disgusting documents in her possession ever since 1887. The fact that a lady called at his address, said he believed the jury would enable the defendant to leave the court as an honourable and straightforward man.—There was some slight applause at the close of the address.

FOR THE PLAINTIFF.

—Mr. Candy proceeded to address the jury for the plaintiff, and said the action was practically undefended, as the defence had no foundation. He contended it was not fair to the jury or the public that the defendant should have been set up in the absence of Wilfred Murray. There was, however, not a scrap of evidence, beyond the oath of the defendant and a single document, that any such person existed. There had been no attempt on the part of the plaintiff to force a compromise. She was determined to have justice, and that or some other court, believing her case to be true and the defendant's case a tissue of lies.—The hearing was again adjourned.

A DISHONEST BANK CLERK.

William Arthur Grossett, a bank clerk, was charged on remand, at the Marlborough-street Police Court, with stealing £100, the money of his employers, Messrs. Liberty and Co., of Regent-street. The prisoner neglected to pay into a bank all the money he had received for that purpose, and when the books were examined it was found they had been falsified to cover his deficiencies. Since the remand it was discovered that two other sums of £150 each had been unaccounted for.—The prisoner pleaded guilty to stealing the amount named in the charge, and was committed to prison, with hard labour, for four months.

INFLUENZA EPIDEMIC IN LINCOLNSHIRE.

In Lincolnshire the influenza epidemic is spreading rapidly. At Horncastle scores of people are suffering, and in the country districts it is particularly bad. At Belkford this week, only one labourer could work on the land, all the others being down with influenza. At Holford and Barrow-on-Humber the epidemic is very serious, and the local doctors state that they have never had their hands so full. Some hundreds of cases are reported at Grimsby.

PITIFUL CASE OF DESTITUTION.

Mr. Wynne E. Baxter held an inquest at Bromley on the body of Mary Ann Pallen, an unmarried woman of 38.—She resided in a house in Bloomfield-street, and earned a living at match-box making. She lived in a room so scantily furnished that, though she had recently given birth to a child, she had only a chair to sit on. The child died, and as no clothing had been prepared for it, the body was hidden under shavings. Several neighbours called in to see her, but though she appeared seriously ill, no doctor was sent for. One witness said the deceased was so ill that she gave her a "pork sausage" to eat; another gave her two eggs beaten up in hot milk and some sugar; and a third said she returned a verdict of death from natural causes, but censured the neighbours for not calling in a doctor.

THE WALPOLE-WIEDEMANN CASE.

The second action by Miss Valery Waldman against Mr. Robert Horne Walpole, late brechenprom as of manace, will very shortly be restored to the paper for hearing. Mr. T. Terrell will not appear as counsel for the plaintiff, who previously conducted her case in person; and the Solicitor-general (Sir E. Clarke, Q.C., M.P.) and Mr. W. Graham will represent the defendant.

TWENTY-FIVE PERSONS POISONED

BY MILK.

Dr. Wright, of Elderslie-street, Glasgow, reports that in a tenement in Pembrick-street, Glasgow, he has twenty-five patients suffering from irritant poisoning. They have been purging and vomiting, and he thought that the poison had been conveyed through the medium of milk. He discovered that the milk came from a farm where there was a cow which had recently calved, and was subsequently seized with fever. The milk supply from this source was at once stopped, and the patients are now out of danger.

Prince Bismarck did not obtain sufficient votes by a thousand in the election at Gastein to constitute an absolute majority, and a second ballot with Herr Schmeidler, the Socialist candidate, will be necessary.

Queen's Bench Division.

City of London Court.

A HUSBAND'S LIABILITY.—The case of *Restand v. Waddam* was heard at this court on Monday last. The plaintiff, Mr. Richard Waddam, of the Bedford-street, Strand, and Mr. Christopher Alexander, of 7, College-court, for the £5s. 9d., the balance of an account.—Mrs. Waddam appeared, and said the goods were supplied to her personally, and not to her husband, as she was in business herself.—Mr. Alexander, plaintiff's counsel, stated that for the last eight or ten years plaintiff had been supplying goods to the defendant, and they had always been paid for by his cheque. Out of this he claimed had been paid in that manner by his wife, who he used for the balance this fence was set up.—Mrs. Waddam admitted that on two or three occasions her husband had paid for goods for her business, but it was always her separate concern.—Mr. Commissioner Kerr: Do you live with your husband?—Mrs. Waddam: Yes, your honour.—Commissioner: Well, there has been a great deal of controversy about the nature of husband and wife. It is to be far a wife is from her husband's control, and her husband having once admitted liability for his wife's debts by paying more than one cannot free himself from the responsibility by setting up that she has separate income from her own earnings. As she continues to live with him, she gets the benefit of this shop, and

ness transactions with him. The prisoner raised money for him on a revelation, and saw him repeatedly. He gave him the address in Swallow-street. He never saw any plate on the prisoner's door. In November the prisoner asked him to lend him £100, and said he would give him two promissory notes, and also deposit with him as collateral security a policy on his life for £500. Before the prisoner had told him he was making £1,000 to £1,500 a year, but he did not say how. The prisoner told him to believe it was by his own efforts, and needed no more. He was a solicitor. He never told him so, however. He was introduced to the prisoner by an Oxford graduate named Martin. He gave the prisoner a cheque for £100, and received two promissory notes, but not the policy. He had no knowledge that the prisoner was an undischarged bankrupt. Mr. Curtis Bennett: Had you known the fellow would have lent him the money?—The Prosecutor: Hardly. The first time I saw him on the 11th of November, he asked me to deposit it in the bank, as he could not meet it. He said it would hurt his credit if I did. Several times he said I should receive the money, but up to the present time I have not had it.—Mr. Haynes, by permission, observed his cross-examination.—Mr. John Vallerie, also a medical student at the same address, said he was introduced to the prisoner by the last witness. The prisoner raised £500 for him on a deed, and he was sent into prison on commission. On January 17th,

George Herring appealed at the London County Sessions, Clerkenwell, on Saturday, against the refusal of the justices of the St. Pancras Division to renew a license for the sale of beer off the premises, 155, Dartmouth Park Hill, St. Pancras, the reason assigned being that he had been found

INQUESTS.

SUSPECT OF A BLIND WOMAN.—Mr. W. E. Baxter held an inquiry concerning the death of Theresa Daster 58, a blind woman, and the wife of a skin-dresser, Cannon Street-road, E.—Clara Daster deposed that she was married to his wife, and she had been blind for 15 years. She said that she had been blind for 15 years, and she had been blind for the 15th inst., he left home for his work, and on his return at 7.0 p.m. he found her in the bed-room door locked. He called her name, and she did not answer. He went to the laundry, and asked her if she had seen the deceased. She replied "No," so he burst open the door, and was horrified to find his wife lying on the floor in a pool of blood. He sent for a doctor, who pronounced life extinct.

There has been severe fighting among the chiefs in Pondoland. Umhlangu has surrendered to the Cape authorities.

(En. 82.) to Guy's Tonic Company, 4, Ludgate Circus, London.
and it will be forwarded by return, post paid.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—Monday.

THE LABOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in answer to Mr. Conboy and Mr. Fenwick, said he could not consent to recommend the Labour Commission, as it was a question of the royal commission, and that the question of sitting with open doors was one entirely for the commission to decide.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER.

Replying to Sir W. Harcourt, said that the budget statement would be made on Thursday week.

RAILWAY RATES COMMITTEE.

Sir J. MOWBRAY, the Chairman of the Committee of Selection, replied to a series of questions put to him by Mr. Sexton in reference to the St. Albans Railway. He said that the Committee of Selection had not yet decided upon the St. Albans Railway. He said that the Committee of Selection had not yet decided upon the St. Albans Railway. He said that the Committee of Selection had not yet decided upon the St. Albans Railway.

IRISH LAND BILL.

The House again went into committee on the Irish Land Bill. Among the amendments proposed on the first clause was one by Mr. STANHOPE requiring that a report setting forth the full particulars of every advance made by the tenant should be made to the House before it was made to the tenant.

HOUSE OF LORDS—Tuesday.

THE DEATH OF EARL GRANVILLE.

The House re-assembled after the Easter recess, and Lord GRANVILLE, who had been absent from the House since the death of Lord GRANVILLE, was present.

THE NEWFOUNDLAND QUESTION.

Lord KILGERRIE, in reply to Lord Kimberley, said he had no intention of pressing on a second reading of the Newfoundland Bill. He said that the Bill was a question of the Newfoundland Bill.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—Tuesday.

THE CITY ELECTION.

At the morning sitting a new writ was issued for the City of London. In the room of Mr. T. C. BARRING, deceased. A bill to amend the law of divorce in England was introduced by Dr. Hunter, and read a first time.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE BILL.

In committee on this bill, the result of the clause was that ten additional lines of the clause were disposed of. The principal amendment was moved by Mr. H. POWELL, the purpose of reducing the dividends on land stock created by the bill, so as to make them the same as the dividends on the land stock of the Government.

PARISH COUNCILS.

The evening sitting, Mr. A. A. CLEGG moved a resolution advocating the establishment of parish councils as a necessary part of any system of local government. He said that the Government had not yet decided upon the establishment of parish councils.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—Wednesday.

A NEW WRIT FOR WHITEHAVEN.

A new writ was ordered for Whitehaven, in the room of Mr. W. H. SMITH, deceased. A bill to amend the law of divorce in England was introduced by Dr. Hunter, and read a first time.

IRISH SUNDAY CLOSING BILL.

Mr. LEA moved the second reading of the Sunday Closing Bill, which provides for the total closing of public-houses in Ireland, and the five towns at present exempted, on a Saturday night from three to five o'clock on Saturday night.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL AND BOY MESSENGERS.

Dr. CAMERON asked the Postmaster-General if he would explain to the House the nature of the arrangements he had entered into with the boy messengers and district service companies. Mr. BAILEY said the arrangements in question were as follows:—The Postmaster-General grants licences to the electric call system in London (such system not to include telephones) and if requested to connect the office of the company and other persons licensed with police stations and fire brigade stations on the same terms as those in force in private wires.

HOUSE OF LORDS—Thursday.

THE CLITHERO ABDUCTION CASE.

Lord WHICKHAM asked the Lord Chancellor whether his attention had been called to the decision in the Clitheroe abduction case, and whether the decision in that case had really such an effect as those statements seemed to import? And if so, whether the Government would propose legislation on the subject?—The Lord Chancellor said he should have been glad to believe the reports inaccurate, as nothing was more inconsistent with the democratic principle than to make general statements of that kind. The Court of Appeal simply released a person whom they held to be in unlawful custody. He was certain the Government would not propose a bill to enable a man to imprison his wife.—Lord Esher, the Master of the Rolls, said the whole case was surrounded with difficulty. If a wife would not give her husband a divorce, and their lordships could define what was meant by that phrase—(laughter)—then formal application should be made to court to enforce them. In past years a wife used to be imprisoned for contempt, but Parliament took away that right, and substituted nothing for it. The difficulty had arisen in consequence of Parliament doing something without thinking of the result.

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

This bill was read a second time, and the House adjourned at 4.10.

CENTRAL LONDON RAILWAY BILL.

On the consideration of this bill as amended, Mr. J. STUART moved the first of a series of amendments with the view of considering an increased number of workmen's trains upon the new electric Central London Railway, running from Shepherd's Bush to the City. It was at first intended that there should be only one such train, but afterwards two trains were proposed, to run from Shepherd's Bush to the City as workmen's trains in the morning, at 6.15 and 7.15, and in the evening, at 6.15 and 7.15.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE BILL.

The House then went into committee on the Irish Land Purchase Bill. Mr. KEAY resumed his speech on his amendment to omit from clause 1 the reference to the Consolidated Fund in connection with the issue of the guaranteed land stock. Mr. A. J. BALFOUR thought that the character of the securities was adequate. It was not the duty of the Government to waste time in discussing them to be over and over again, and the honourable gentleman's chief point was an arithmetical one. Mr. J. MOWBRAY moved a new provision to the effect that no guarantee land stock should be issued by way of advance for the purchase of any holding unless such advance had been previously approved by the House of Commons.

THE MANIPUR MASSACRE.

The House then went into committee on the Manipur Massacre Bill. Mr. KEAY resumed his speech on his amendment to omit from clause 1 the reference to the Consolidated Fund in connection with the issue of the guaranteed land stock. Mr. A. J. BALFOUR thought that the character of the securities was adequate. It was not the duty of the Government to waste time in discussing them to be over and over again, and the honourable gentleman's chief point was an arithmetical one.

THE CHARGES AGAINST M.P.'S.

Mr. MORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it is true that warrants have been issued against two members of this House for criminal offences, and whether it is also true that both members have left the country and are now out of the jurisdiction of our law courts. Mr. MATTHEWS: The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. So far as my information goes, both members are now out of the jurisdiction. I am permitted to read a telegram, addressed by the Hon. member for North Devon (Mr. Vernon) from Paris to Mr. Speaker, in these terms:—"Seeing a question is to be asked about me in the House, it is my duty to inform you that as soon as I heard in Italy that a warrant had been issued for my arrest I started at once, and expect to reach London to-morrow." (Opposition cheers.)

A LUCKY BARMID.

A young woman named Rachael Walker, a native of Liverpool, who is employed as a barmaid at a restaurant at Port Jervis, New York, was attacked by three men while on her way home. She managed to elude them and fled back to the restaurant where she is employed. She procured a pistol from one of the managers and started for home again. The same man who was waiting for her in the head and another in the stomach. Her third assailant fled, and the wounded man are now in the hospital. One of them is expected to die.

THE NEWFOUNDLAND DELEGATES.

Mr. MORTON informed Mr. Munro Ferguson that Mr. Munro Ferguson was not aware whether the Newfoundland delegates desired to be heard before the second reading of the Newfoundland Bill, but the matter should be decided by the House.

DR. GRACE ON CRICKET.

You must play at cricket, not play with it; such was the golden rule enforced—with the business end of a stump—at a public school which regarded Latin and Greek as elegant accomplishments but cricket as the serious business of life. Even football was tolerated only because it kept you in training for the cricket season. Dr. Grace was not a pupil at this public school, but he has caught the spirit, and his book on cricket (J. W. Arrowsmith) shows how single-hearted his devotion must be if you really wish to excel in the very best game that ever was or will be invented. The book is free from the sensational fine writing indulged in by second-rate sporting chroniclers, of whom the worst of all is the facetious species, and next worst the long-winded one. Dr. Grace's book is crammed full with facts so well arranged that you can turn in a few moments to an authentic record of all the great events of the game, and the book is free from the sensational fine writing indulged in by second-rate sporting chroniclers, of whom the worst of all is the facetious species, and next worst the long-winded one.

THE MANIPUR MASSACRE.

The House then went into committee on the Manipur Massacre Bill. Mr. KEAY resumed his speech on his amendment to omit from clause 1 the reference to the Consolidated Fund in connection with the issue of the guaranteed land stock. Mr. A. J. BALFOUR thought that the character of the securities was adequate. It was not the duty of the Government to waste time in discussing them to be over and over again, and the honourable gentleman's chief point was an arithmetical one.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

At the Marlborough-street Police Court, Mr. HANNAY resumed the hearing of the charge against the Persian Consul, Mr. CLOETE, of having obtained the sum of £15,750 from Mr. Agnes Atina Paga by means of false pretences. Mr. Besley, addressing the magistrate for the defence, said it seemed to him that the question of whether there was any misrepresentation in Mr. CLOETE's statements to Mr. Paga, was a question of fact, and that there was no case to go to a jury. He was settled by Mr. CLOETE's statement that the International Company was solvent, and had plenty of assets in July last. Mr. Bodkin (who was with Mr. Besley) in addressing the magistrate upon the question of Mr. CLOETE's relations to the Persian Government, said that he had been an honorary attaché to the Persian Embassy in January last. Mr. Hannay observed that he had received a communication from the Foreign Office, from which he gathered that Mr. CLOETE was not an attaché to the Persian Embassy. Mr. Bodkin replied that Mr. CLOETE's appointment being so recent, and he being a British subject, he was not an attaché. Mr. Besley, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah. Mr. W. James Mann, a civil engineer residing at Upper Norwood, said that he had been appointed by Mr. CLOETE to act as "chancellor de bureau" to the consulate. About a month or two ago, Mr. CLOETE, who was not present in the list submitted to the court, and he was not recognised by the Shah.

THE CHARGE AGAINST A CONSUL.

EXTRAORDINARY CURE OF A

AFTER THE LATE LEC.
THE DISTINCTION. A certain class of Sues of every description when all other remedies have failed, will be cured by the use of
C. WARD, 114, Finsbury-road, Upper Holloway.

THE MODERN REMEDY FOR LADIES.
THE FEMINE PILLS.—Certain and safe. Made only of the purest and most delicate ingredients. It is desired effect, and prevent all irregularities. It is sold in 2s. 6d. the box, by post, from Mrs. W. ALLAN & Co., 10, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4.

THE MAGIC FEMALE PILLS.
 THE GREAT REMEDY FOR ALL AFFECTIONS OF THE LIVER & BILIOUS AFFECTIONS. It is the only medicine that cures all irregularities, such as abdominal pain, flatulency, indigestion, constipation, &c. It is sold in 2s. 6d. the box, by post, from Mrs. W. ALLAN & Co., 10, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4.

MADAME FRANK'S M.D. FAMOUS FEMALE MIXTURE.
 Most effective on earth. For the most free of all ailments. Will cure all diseases of the female sex. Price is 6d. (Shilling, 1s. 6d.) the bottle. Sold free of postage by post, from Mrs. W. ALLAN & Co., 10, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4. (opposite Shakespeare Church), London, E.C. 4. Stamp enclosed for proofs and particulars.

THE GREAT FEMALE REMEDY
 FROM ANY CAUSE AND LONG STANDING. This remedy is the only one that cures all diseases of the female sex. Price is 6d. (Shilling, 1s. 6d.) the bottle. Sold free of postage by post, from Mrs. W. ALLAN & Co., 10, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4. (opposite Shakespeare Church), London, E.C. 4. Stamp enclosed for proofs and particulars.

tree - MOSS and BARKS, Fungus-like, stamped envelope.

IMPORTANT TO LADIES.

THE most wonderful medicine ever discovered for the treatment of long-standing, Throatitis, has been recently obtained by this mixture, and the remedy is so reliable by its mixture, and is so effective, perfectly harmless; never fails to bring about the desired result, and is so tested by the most experienced physicians, and is so female. Numerous successful testimonials. PILLS ARE USELESS, and only bring the disappointment of a false promise. The only effective remedy is PARSAM, Walmsworth. The only effective remedy is PARSAM on earth. Try and judge for yourselves.

RHEUMATIC BELT FOR HOW TO OBTAIN IT.

TO introduce it and obtain agents, the undersigned will give away a New Belt of the Rheumatic Belt, to the first person who will send him a letter to the Editor of the New York Electrical Journal, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 79

OWBRIDGE'S STOMACHIC
(A Concentrated Compound Fluid Extract)
FOR THE PERMANENT CURE OF INDIGESTION
with its resultant forms of General Debility
THE FINEST DIGESTIVE MEDICINE IN THE
WORLD.
Prepared by **W. T. OWBRIDGE, The Laborer**
Hall.

DR. DAVIS'S FAMOUS FEMALE PILL
PEARL COATED AND TASTELESS.
ARE composed of Steel, Pennyroyal, Bitter Apple,
Aloes, Pil Cochia, and two other Drugs known
only to Dr. Davis.
NO IRREGULARITY OR OBSTRUCTION

can resist them.
 94, St. 140, St. 36, & Co. Send them from observation.
 MR. PORTOBELLO-ROAD, NOTTING HILL
 LONDON.
 OR ORDER OF ANY CURRENCY.
 Advice free, 7.5 till 10.0, on receipt of stamped
 envelope.

BLAIR'S
GOUT
 AND
RHEUMATIC
PILLS.

CURE GOUT.
 CURE RHEUMATISM.
 CURE SCIATICA.
 CURE LUMBAGO.
 CURE NEURALGIA.

The EXCRUCIATING
 PAIN is quickly relieved
 and cured in a few days
 when Celebrated Pills
 are used. See the GILK
 REMEDY for all
 complaints. No restriction
 of diet during use.
 Sold by all Chemists &
 1st and 2nd, per box

DODD'S FEMALE PILLS.

THE HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN—The largest and best known in London, has never known those Pills to fail in moving the most obstinate cases of **FEMALE IRREGULARITIES & OBSTRUCTION**. We had seen only a few hundred thousands of both **MARRIED** and **SINGLE WOMEN** with the most marvellous results. Thousands of testimonials from patients who attended the Hospital for Women, St. Mary's.

All Chemists and Patent Medicine Vendors keep on hand.

ASK for DODD'S INSECT on having DODD'S
in Boxes is 10d., 2s. 6d., 4s. 6d., and 10s. 6d.

Post free, under cover, from
JEFFERSON DODD,
79, Tottenham Court-road, London.

A CLEAR COMPLEXION,
Pimples, Head-aches, Sunburn, Freckles,
unusually Blisters on the Face, Neck,
and Hands, can be instantly removed by using
JAMES' HIKER'S SKIN EMULSION made from
the purest and warmest pemmican, it imparts a
lovely clearness to the skin that astunishes every
of all Chemists, is let. A box (with direct
stamp free from observation, post free, on receipt
stamp to
Mrs. JAMES, 26, Caledonian-road, London,
E.C.1.

without injury to the Skin. Of most Chemists, sent, with directions for use, free from cost. 10 stamps.

Mrs. JAMES. No, Caledonian-road, London,

D^R. RIDGE'S	THE EFFECT
Patent Compound	FOOD
	FOR

FOOD.	CHILDREN AND INVALIDS.
DR. HIGGETT'S Pulverized Cod-Liver Oil	CAUTION. ALL the Genuine "Pulverized Cod-Liver Oil" is MARKED WITH A TRADE-MARK. DR. HIGGETT'S

FOOD.	Gives the most perfect digestion of milk.
<p>DR. RIDGE'S</p> <p>Patent Cooked</p>	<p>Prepared at</p> <p>THE ROYAL MILLS, LONDON</p> <p>and Solely Chemical Preparation of the Hospital.</p>
FOOD.	

THE ALOFAS COMPANY
SAFE HERBAL SPECIALTIES.

A LOFAS TINCTURE—New Cure for Coughs, Bronchitis, Hoarseness, and all Croup and Croup-like Affections.

A LOFAS POWDER—Cures all Wasting Diseases, Night Sweats, Debility, Brain Fag, etc.

A LOFAS PILL for Indigestion, Constipation,

A LOPAS STOMACHING Cures Flatulences, Hiccups, Indigestion, Colic and Heart Troubles.
A LOPAS EMEROCATION.—A Boon to Athletes.
A LOPAS FEMALE TINCTURE
A LOPAS SALVE OINTMENT for Chaps, Cuts, Cracks, Rough Skins, Ulcers.
A LOPAS RINGWORM OINTMENT.—A Safe and Effective Remedy.
A LOPAS OINTMENT FOR PILLS

THE ALOPA'S HAIR RESTORER—Wonderful success in cases of Weakness or Fall Out of the Hair, Baldness, &c. 2s. post free.

The Alopa's Remedies, price 1s. 1ld., 2s., 6d., and each. Free from all poisons and injurious ingredients. Sold by all Chemists, or post free THE ALOPA'S COMPANY, 20, New Oxford-street, London, W. U.

Manchester Depot, 19, Great Ducie-street. Send postcard for The Alopa's Guide to Health.

